



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,279	10/23/2003	Arthur Howarth	CISCP347/7692	4138
22434	7590	11/05/2008		
BEYER WEAVER LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 70250			NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2454	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/05/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/693,279

**Applicant(s)**

HOWARTH ET AL.

**Examiner**

DUSTIN NGUYEN

**Art Unit**

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al. [ US Patent Application No 2002/0083342 ], in view of Seki [ US Patent Application No 2003/0018753 ].

4. As per claim 1, Webb discloses the invention as claimed including a computer readable medium for providing controlled access to a home network [ i.e. accessing devices on private networks via clients on a public network ] [ Figure 1; and Abstract ], the computer program including instructions for causing one or more devices of the home network to perform steps comprising:

receiving a log-in attempt from a remote user [ i.e. gateway accepts user's log-in request ] [ 210, Figure 4; Abstract; and paragraphs 0008 and 0047 ], the log-in attempt originating from

an Internet protocol address [ i.e. public internet network ] [ 12, Figure 1; and paragraphs 0044 and 0045 ];

verifying that the remote user is an authorized user of the home network [ i.e. determine whether authorize to access ] [ 220, Figure 4; and paragraphs 0047 and 0048 ];

generating a network address translation rule associating the Internet protocol address with a port of a device on the home network [ i.e. address mapping ] [ Figure 2; and paragraphs 0044, 0045 and 0049 ];

displaying a graphical user interface to the remote user [ i.e. browser ] [ 240, Figure 4; and paragraphs 0032 and 0049 ], the graphical user interface allowing the remote user to select only content or services that the remote user is authorized to select [ i.e. access rights for particular device ] [ 230, Figure 4; and paragraphs 0009 and 0050 ];

receiving a selection request from the remote user [ i.e. user selects link ] [ 250, Figure 4; and paragraphs 0032 and 0051 ];

the content or service includes one or more of photos, music, documents, videos, games or video or image data from one or more Internet cameras [ Figure 1; and paragraphs 0004, 0028, 0033 and 0043 ]; and

providing content or services to the remote user according to the selection request [ i.e. serve web page to user's client ] [ 280, Figure 4; and paragraphs 0009, 0010 and 0051 ], wherein the receiving, verifying, generating, and providing are performed by one or more devices of the home network [ 14, Figure 1; Abstract; and paragraphs 0008-0011, 0044 and 0047 ].

Webb does not specifically disclose receiving content from one or more devices on the home network using a content protocol.

Seki discloses receiving content from one or more devices on the home network using a content protocol [ i.e. content data is transmitted and displayed on remote terminal ] [ Abstract; and paragraphs 0005, 0105 and 0111, 0132 and 0137 ].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Webb and Seki because the teaching of Seki to connect packet from IP to IEEE1394 network would enable to remotely control apparatus on a home network from an external network [ Seki, paragraphs 0002 ].

5. As per claim 2, Webb discloses instructions for causing a gateway of the home network to transmit authentication information regarding the remote user to one or more devices of the home network after verifying that the remote user is an authorized user of the home network [ i.e. redirect client request to web server of device ] [ 250, Figure 4; Abstract; and paragraphs 0010 and 0045 ].

6. As per claim 3, Webb does not specifically disclose instructions for causing a gateway of the home network to communicate with the remote user according to a first protocol different from a second protocol used for communication between the gateway and one or more devices of the home network. Seki discloses instructions for causing a gateway of the home network to communicate with the remote user according to a first protocol different from a second protocol used for communication between the gateway and one or more devices of the home network [

i.e. rewrite the header information of the packet from IP to IEEE1394 ] [ ST434, ST435, Figure 4B; and paragraph 0162 ]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Webb and Seki because the teaching of Seki to connect packet from IP to IEEE1394 network would enable to remotely control apparatus on a home network from an external network [ Seki, paragraphs 0002 ].

7. As per claim 4, Webb discloses wherein the first protocol is HTTP [ paragraphs 0028 and 0030 ].

8. As per claim 5, Seki discloses wherein the second protocol is a content protocol [ paragraphs 0005 and 0105 ].

9. As per claim 6, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1. Furthermore, Webb discloses a gateway configured to provide controlled access to a home network, the gateway comprising: a first port configured to receive a log-in attempt from a remote user, and a second port configured for attaching a network device of the home network [ Abstract; and paragraphs 0009, 0010, 0044 and 0045 ].

10. As per claim 7, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

11. As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.

12. As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.

13. As per claim 10, Webb discloses wherein the first network device comprises a personal computer or a network attached storage device [ 10, Figure 1; and paragraph 0042 ].

14. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Webb discloses a second network device, the gateway being further configured to: receive a second selection request from the remote user; and provide services to the remote user from the second network device according to the second selection request [ 250-280, Figure 4; and paragraphs 0047-0050 ].

15. As per claim 12, Webb discloses wherein the second network device is a webcam or a device for streaming audio data [ 18-24, Figure 1; and paragraphs 0003 and 0004 ].

16. As per claims 13 and 14, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 2.

17. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.

18. As per claims 16 and 17, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4 and 5.

19. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.
20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dustin Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454